

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

JANET HENNICK,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. 15-C-1190

**CAROLYN W. COLVIN,
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,**

Defendant.

DECISION AND ORDER

Pro se Plaintiff Janet Hennick (“Hennick”) seeks leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) (ECF No. 2) on her appeal from the denial of her applications for social security disability benefits and supplemental security income. In order to authorize a litigant to proceed IFP, the Court must make two determinations: first, whether the litigant is unable to pay the costs of commencing this action; and second, whether the action is frivolous or malicious. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(a) and (e)(2)(B)(i). The Court must deny a request to proceed IFP if (1) the allegation of poverty is untrue; (2) the action is frivolous; (3) the action fails to state a claim; or (4) the action seeks monetary relief against an immune defendant. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

By her petition and affidavit to proceed IFP, Hennick avers that she is single and has no persons whom she is legally responsible to support.

Hennick does laundry and house chores in exchange for rent and receives \$189 in public assistance each month. She owns a 2008 Nissan Altima worth \$20,000, and she has \$200 in a checking or savings account. Hennick's monthly expenses exceed her monthly total income by roughly \$47.33 which she pays for car insurance.

Based on the information provided, Hennick has satisfied the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) by demonstrating that she is unable to pay the \$350 filing fee for this action. Furthermore, Hennick's Complaint states arguable claims for relief. Accordingly, Hennick's petition for leave to proceed IFP is granted.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BASED ON THE FOREGOING, IT IS
HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

Hennick's petition for leave to proceed IFP (ECF No. 2) is **GRANTED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 21st day of October, 2015.

BY THE COURT:


HON. RUDOLPH T. RANDA
U.S. District Judge